

52



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,806	08/07/2000	Sameh W. Asaad	YOR9-2000-0175	3370

21254 7590 06/16/2004
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

DINH, DUC Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/633,806

Applicant(s)

ASAAD ET AL.

Examiner

DUC Q DINH

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-14 and 19-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-14 and 19-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/7/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 6-14 and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The original disclosure, when filed does not disclose "a first portion comprising a first local bus based on a first protocol and a first interface to convert a serial signal into to said first protocol, said second portion comprising a second local bus based on said first protocol and a second interface to convert said first protocol into said serial signal, said first protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 1 and 14); or

Art Unit: 2674

at least a portion of an extended bus bridge, said portion comprising a first local bus based on a protocol and an interface to convert a serial into said protocol, said protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 9) ”.

The disclosure, specifically Fig. 3, page 8 only discloses, “ B0 is the primary side interface of the chip, and it interfaces to the primary PCI bus as a regular PCI-PCI bridge. All PCI addressed to B0 is serialized across a high –speed serial link using, for example, a Gigabit Ethernet as its physical layer. On the remote side of the serial cable, interface B1 converts the serial stream back to PCI traffic and relays it to the graphic card now connected to the secondary PCI (bus 1) as shown”.

However, the specification as originally filed does not provide a support for the claim limitation “a first portion comprising a first local bus based on a first protocol and a first interface to convert a serial signal into to said first protocol, said second portion comprising a second local bus based on said first protocol and a second interface to convert said first protocol into said serial signal, said first protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 1 and 14); or at least a portion of an extended bus bridge, said portion comprising a first local bus based on a protocol and an interface to convert a serial into said protocol, said protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 9) ”.

The examiner examines the application based on the best understood of the claim language.

Art Unit: 2674

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-11, 14, 19-20 and 22-23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art, (page 1 through page 4 line 7), hereinafter AAPA.

In reference to claim 1, the AAPA discloses a system for displaying information comprising: a CPU coupled to the bus bridge 103 at first portion; a graphic adaptor 104 couple to the second portion of the bus bridge; a monitor couple to the graphic adaptor; and a serial link from the PC box to the monitor display. The AAPA fails to suggest that the graphic adaptor is localized to the monitor; and a serial link for coupling the first and second portions of the extended bus bridge.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to relocate the graphic adaptor from the PC box to the monitor as desired as was judicially recognized with IN RE JAPIKEE USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950), which recognizes that the relocation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter.

And it would also been obvious to separate the bus bridge in the AAPA system as desired as was judicially recognized with IN NERWIN V. ERLICHMAN, 168 USPQ 177, 179 (PTO BD. OF INT. 1969), which recognizes that the separation of well known element is normally not

desired toward patentable subject matter and use the serial link 102 in the AAPA system to connect two portions of the bus together to transfer display data for the system.

In reference to claim 6, the AAPA discloses the cable 102 in Fig 1.

In reference to claim 7, the AAPA discloses that the extended bus bridge is a PCI bus bridge (page 1, line 9) coupled to graphic adaptor.

In reference to claims 9-11 and 22, refer to the rejection as applied to claims 1, 6-7.

In reference to claims 14, 19-20 and 23 are method claims corresponding to the apparatus of claims 1, 6-7, and 9-11; and therefore, rejected based on the same basis set forth in said claims.

6. Claims 8, 12-13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Strongin (U. S. Patent No. 6,304,935).

In reference to claims 8, 12-13 and 21, the AAPA fails to disclose that the at least portion of the extended bridge comprises an Accelerated Graphic Port (AGP) bus bridge coupled to the graphic adaptor. Strongin discloses a portion of a AGP bus bridge 104 coupled to the graphic processor 202 as claimed.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made provide the AGP bus bridge to couple the graphic processor for the system of the AAPA because it would alleviate data bottlenecking for the system (col. 6, lines 1-6).

7. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view Miyamoto et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,097,364), hereinafter Miyamoto.

In reference to claims 24-25 the AAPA fails to disclose that only the information that change is transferred to the display device. Miyamoto discloses a display control apparatus in which only the information that changes is transferred to the display unit (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 5-25).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Miyamoto for transferring only information that changes to the monitor in the AAPA's device because it would provide a system that could increase the data processing speed by only the updating the changing portion of a screen image.

8. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Kikuchi (U. S. Patent No. 5,576,735)

In reference to claim 26, the AAPA fails to disclose the parallel connection between the graphics adaptor and the monitor. Kikuchi discloses a parallel connection between the display system and the graphic adaptor (Fig. 5-7, column 10, lines 24-65).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Kikuchi, i.e.: using the parallel connection between the graphic controller and the display device, in the AAPA device for increasing the data transferring speed between the graphics adapter and the display device.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments see pages 6-15 of the Amendment, filed 03/09/04 has been considered but not persuasive. With respect to the 112 First Paragraph Rejection, see the above

Art Unit: 2674

112 rejection above, there is not support in the specification for the limitation “a first portion comprising a first local bus based on a first protocol and a first interface to convert a serial signal into to said first protocol, said second portion comprising a second local bus based on said first protocol and a second interface to convert said first protocol into said serial signal, said first protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 1 and 14); or at least a portion of an extended bus bridge, said portion comprising a first local bus based on a protocol and an interface to convert a serial into said protocol, said protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 9) ”

With respect to the art rejection, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to relocate the graphic adaptor from the PC box to the monitor as desired as was judicially recognized with *IN RE JAPIKEE* USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950), which recognizes that the relocation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter. And it would also been obvious to separate the bus bridge in the AAPA system as desired as was judicially recognized with *IN NERWIN V. ERLICHMAN*, 168 USPQ 177, 179 (PTO BD. OF INT. 1969), which recognizes that the separation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter and use the serial link 102 in the AAPA system to connect two portions of the bus together to transfer display data for the system.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Clearly, the present invention, by separating the graphic adapter 104 from the PC box 11 and placing it adjacent to the monitor 101 have overcome a data bandwidth bottleneck in the conventional

Art Unit: 2674

system, while simultaneously addressing the problem of electromagnetic radiation... “.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DUC Q DINH** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5412**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, Va Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Application/Control Number: 09/633,806

Page 9

Art Unit: 2674


DUC Q DINH

Examiner

Art Unit 2674

DQD

June 10, 2004


REGINA LIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER